

**REMARKS**

None of the claims have been amended herein. Claims 1-18 and 20-24 are pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**I. REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER Ng (US PATENT NO. 6,405,175B1):**

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Ng fails to recite all of the features as recited in claim 18. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that “individuals recommend combination product information through the Internet” by providing a Google search of a wedding dress and veil combination and therefore it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized combination product information in the product information registering method of Ng. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Official Notice taken by the Examiner.

Ng discloses a website which allows users to search a product/price database which contains a variety of products from many different suppliers such as online and offline stores. The information in the database is collected and corrected by submitting users who are rewarded for product submissions. Consumers are rewarded for supplying information about lower prices for products (see Abstract and column 4, lines 65-66). That is, submitting users are rewarded for submitted lower prices for products. Thus, Ng teaches away from the claimed invention.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that although the email provided by the Examiner indicates a recommendation for a wedding dress and veil combination via the internet, the email does not teach or suggest “entering given items of combination information by the terminal of the user by an e-mail or access to a Web page for making registration of combination information,” as recited in claim 18.

Instead, the email merely indicates the combination of one wedding dress and the veil being for sale by an individual. That is, this is not a product combination to be registered in a database for other consumers to purchase the same combination.

Thus, it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize combination product information as shown in the email, in the product information registering method of Ng.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-17 AND 20-24 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER JACOBI ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 2001/00291A1; HEREINAFTER “JACOBI”) IN VIEW OF NG:**

Neither Jacobi nor Ng, individually or combined, teach or suggest all of the features disclosed in claim 1. Specifically, neither of the foregoing references teach “receiving combination information about combination of products from a terminal of a person who has bought the products, and making registration of said combination information with a data, so that the combination information can be accumulated, and searching the database in response to inquiry information about the combination information from the terminal of the user to supply the terminal of the user with corresponding combination information extracted from the database on the basis of the inquiry information,” as recited in claim 1.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Jacobi does not require recommendations/ratings of others. Instead, Jacobi teaches that the recommended items are identified using a previously-generated table which maps individual items to lists of “similar items” such as a purchaser buying a book on a particular topic where additional books are provided to the purchaser on a similar topic (see paragraphs [0011] and [0017]).

The Examiner asserts that Ng makes up for the deficiencies of Jacobi.

The Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine these references considering Jacobi teaches away from requiring recommendations of others and specifically recites “the recommendations are generated without the need for the user or any other users, to rate items” (see paragraph [0011]). Further, Ng teaches away from the claimed invention for the reasons mentioned above.

Therefore, the combination of Jacobi in view of Ng fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Accordingly, claims 1-17 and 20-24 patentably distinguish over Jacobi in view of Ng. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**III. CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each

Docket No.: 1095.1179

Serial No. 09/817,289

of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

Dec 27, 2004

By:

Deidre M. Davis

Deidre M. Davis  
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501